

# Light:

*A Journal of Psychical, Occult, and Mystical Research.*

"WHATEVER DOTH MAKE MANIFEST IS LIGHT."—Paul.

"LIGHT, MORE LIGHT!"—Goethe

No. 565.—VOL. XI. [Registered as a Newspaper.] SATURDAY, OCTOBER 31, 1891. [Registered as a Newspaper.] PRICE TWOPENCE.

## CONTENTS.

Notes by the Way .....	517	Spirit Identity .....	525
Memorial of Dr. Morell .....	518	Dream Verification .....	525
"Esoteric Basis of Christianity" ..	519	In Memoriam — Mr. Cornelius ..	526
Results of Assurance .....	520	Pearson .....	526
"Ancient Beliefs in a Future State" ..	522	Erradiation v. Concrete Suggestion ..	526
"New Teaching for the New Age" ..	523	Spiritualism and Science .....	527
An Astronomer's Philosophy .....	524	A Further Remonstrance .....	528
		"The Church of the Future" .....	528

## NOTES BY THE WAY.

Contributed by the Acting Editor.

"The Arena" is an American monthly which not only contains very good matter, but is conducted in a spirit, and possesses a tone, which is in the highest degree true, and morally vivifying. The general public being, or rather being assumed to be, in a somewhat torpid state, it is generally supposed that soothing rather than exhilarating strains will suit them best, and therefore pay best to provide. It is all the more refreshing, therefore, to find a periodical which is non-conventional all round, and is in the interests neither of conventional theology, conventional science, conventional agnosticism, nor conventional secularism or Atheism: of all which, and of all other conventionalism whatsoever, earnest and discerning men are getting heartily tired. There was, perhaps, a time when the only conventionalism was the dominant "'tis," and the contrary "'tisn't" was new. But now one gets quite as weary of the conventional "'tisn't" as of the conventional "'tis," and suspects that a large amount of self-interest and bigotry lurks behind both.

Among the articles in this month's "Arena" is one by Moncure Conway on "Madame Blavatsky at Adyar." Now although no one who knew him would ever suspect Mr. Conway of being knowingly unfair, still there was a good deal of intellectual bias about him, and I own he is not the man to whom I should go for any really fair account of any one who did not limit his or her notions to the narrow boundary-walls of material science. But there is one point in his paper which is a pure matter of fact and veracity, and on which, therefore, his testimony is quite admissible. He has been describing how cordially Madame Blavatsky welcomed him at Adyar, and how several young Hindoos, by whom she was surrounded, were eager to relate their "marvellous experiences in receiving from the distant Mahatmas immediate answers to their letters." The story is thus continued as follows:—

The letters, it was explained, were placed in "the Shrine," and I at once proposed to write a note referring to some matters known to myself only. . . . "What a pity," broke in Madame Blavatsky, who had not participated in the conversation, "only three days ago I was told by my Guru that the Shrine was not to be used for letters any more."

At this Mr. Conway was, perhaps, to be pardoned for feeling a little vexed. He continues:—

Madame Blavatsky, who betrayed no embarrassment whatever, presently rose, invited me to accompany her, and led me into a secluded room. Here she shut the door, lit a cigarette, offered me one, and sat serenely waiting for my next move. I told her I had a sincere purpose in coming; some of my valued friends were deeply interested in Theosophy. If extraordinary

events were really occurring none could be more ready to acknowledge them than myself. I had a congregation in London, and we were not afraid to recognise new facts if verified. "Now," I said, "what do these rumours mean? I hear of your lifting teapots from beneath your chair, summoning lost jewels, conversing with Mahatmas a thousand miles away." "Your questions shall be answered," said Madame Blavatsky. "You are a public teacher, and ought to know the truth. It is glamour; people think they see what they do not see. That is the whole of it."

Of course it does not follow that in telling this story Mr. Conway has disposed of Madame Blavatsky's character. Belief in the fraudulent intention of anyone should never be admitted but upon absolutely resistless evidence, and this is far from being so. What common ground was there between the cock-sure-you-are-wrong-if-you-believe-anything-outside-science Moncure Conway and one who believed herself the instrument used by a power superior to her own for occasionally performing what to ordinary notions was miraculous? Unless we are prepared to deny that the production of occult phenomena is entirely independent of the nature and personal bias of anyone who demands to see them done, we cannot but recognise the difficulty that Madame Blavatsky was involved in during the interview. To have said, "I can perform wonders for 'A,' but not for 'B,'" would have been, to Mr. Conway, tantamount to a confession of imposture; and yet it would have been in the strictest sense of the word scientifically true.

All this should be considered and rightly weighed. For myself I confess that if I were asked if Madame Blavatsky was a fraud I should "treat it as a conundrum and give it up," as Artemus Ward says. Now that she is dead and unable to answer for herself, I am distinctly of opinion that these insinuations should be dropped. Spiritualists, at all events, should not be betrayed into joining in the popular outcry against H. P. B., for those who raise it would just as soon turn it against them as against her. Far better would it be for both Spiritualist and Theosophist to recognise that it is useless boasting of wonders to persons not capable of appreciating the subtlety of the conditions under which alone they can be produced. The great thing to be done is, not to produce astonishment, but to bring the inquirer to that point of view from which the "miracle" ceases to be miraculous: that is, to bring him to be capable of cognising those subtle spiritual forces with the perception of which the phenomenon, once mysterious, becomes simple and natural.

I have received another letter from the gentleman whose signature is "I.O." complaining of the inadequacy of Mr. Page Hopps' reply to his objection to a Church of "Our Father," as seeming to involve a logical exclusion of the feminine in the idea of the Divine Spirit. But considering the pressure there is upon our space "I.O." must excuse me if I dismiss the matter with this passing reference in these notes. "I.O." may, I think, rest assured that no one of any philosophic insight would maintain that any definite element can be excluded from the universal. If we find elements which we term masculine,



feminine, neuter, in the world in which we live, we may be sure that principles, of which these are analogues, are in the universal spirit. Otherwise it would be not universal.

But it seems to me a very materialistic view to suppose that in the Divine the masculine and feminine element are distinguished as they are with us. They exist, but in a way that we are, from the nature of the case, incapable of appreciating, and to seek to drag them forth and make them prominent features of the idea of God seems to me as great a mistake on the one side as to assert that the masculine element was in the Divine but the feminine was not, would be on the other. There is no real dispute, I apprehend, between Mr. Hopps and "I.O." Mr. Hopps is seeking a title for the new organisation he is proposing. Existing Churches are largely, in spirit, Churches of "Our Master." Mr. Hopps seek to express the different spirit which he would embody in his by calling it the Church of Our Father. The antithesis involved is not *our Mother* but *our Master*.

It is always a pity to try to create a controversy where none really exists, and I hold that there is no evidence whatever that Mr. Hopps intends to deny the feminine in the Divine. Our language was constructed to suit our conditions, and not those of Divine nature, hence we distinguish "he," "she," "it," though often, even with us, "she" is recognised as being involved in the masculine pronoun. But it is quite unnecessary to carry distinctions which only arise out of our limitations, into our conception of the Divine nature. Ideally, of course, it would be well if we had a pronoun which contained no suspicion of any sexual distinction, but as we have not got such a word we may quite legitimately use "He," and no one has any right to assume that in using it we distinctly intend to exclude "she" or "it."

If "I. O." is to be consistent he must revise the whole phraseology of Scripture where "he" frequently involves "she." Thousands of instances could be quoted; we will be content to give one. "It is not in man that walketh to direct his steps." Does "I. O." seriously propose to alter it to "It is not in man or woman that walketh to direct his or her steps"? And was it a blunder in Jesus Christ to say to His disciples, "When ye pray say Our Father"? How grotesque it would be to add "and Mother." To make this addition would be definitely to suggest that the two might be supposed not both to be present, and that the Divine Spirit was conditioned somewhat as ourselves. Everything depends on the antithesis in view which determines the choice of the word. "Mother" is not necessarily the only antithesis to "Father." As pointed out above "Master" is equally an antithesis; and our Lord in saying "Our Father" did not mean to imply "remember God is Father and not Mother," but "remember that God is in the nearest and closest natural relation to you, and is not merely *Master*, or some exalted Being quite out of practical touch with you, and with whom you can have nothing in common."

And this reminds me of a little story, told, I think, by Dean Ramsay. I can only quote it from memory. The minister of a parish was consoling a poor woman, whose daughter had died, with the common reflection that the girl had gone to God, a matter rather of thankfulness than of regret. To which the mother replied, "It's no that that I'm doubting, but ye ken they're a' men folk up there."

Mrs. Besant is going to India; some persons suggest, to receive a certain initiation into the yet higher mysteries of Occultism. I suppose it can scarcely be said that she is going to investigate, because she is probably satisfied

already, and needs no further convincing. But we may be sure that she will keep her eyes open. And if she comes back and tells us clearly and unequivocally that she has seen a Mahatma and witnessed his power—not merely in his astral body but in his earthly corpus—we shall feel it difficult to deny the testimony; because, when we remember what a shrewd observer Mrs. Besant is, we are constrained to admit that it would require almost as real occult power to deceive and hoodwink her, as to perform actually the wonder purported to have been done.

This is, of course, quite a different thing from saying that we shall feel bound to accept the doctrine of the Mahatmas. Even if we are unable to doubt the actuality of their existence, Mrs. Besant herself would be the first to admit that there can be no test of truth other than perception in the mind that the principle, or doctrine, asserted fits in and harmonises with our general apprehension of the Order of things. Another person's opinion, be he Mahatma, or angel, or spirit, may be useful as suggesting to us new views of truth, new ideas of the possible, but can possess no authority to justify us in accepting what he says, without being at the pains to think whether it harmonises with or contradicts that general trend of view which results from our being as we are, and from the fixed and predetermined nature of our minds.

Consistency is the great thing, and yet a thing often conspicuous by its absence. People will not be at the trouble to think out what is really involved in the faith they profess to believe. Professed believers in the Unity live lives that are logical outcomes of the idea of duality; and remain to the end of their days unaware of the contradiction. Nothing is so much needed in these days as that people should make up their minds as to what general view of things they can accept, what philosophy of life most commends itself to them. Whether they think the universe is an Order or a disorder; whether there is *One* force or power in it, or two; whether that force is an evolving force *in them*, carrying them on in a never deflected stream of progress towards some transcendent end; or whether it is purely indifferent to them and leaves them, in the most absolute sense of the word, to work out their own salvation, or loss, by their own utterly unaided power.

#### MEMORIAL OF DR. MORELL.\*

In this beautiful quarto volume Dr. Theobald has given a very comprehensive sketch of a quiet, uneventful life, full of steady work and intellectual activity. It has been compiled to meet the wishes of Dr. Morell's many friends. In the preface it is intimated that copies will be supplied to any relatives or old friends who may wish to possess a memento of one of the most intellectual English authors and workers of this century. As there is a publisher's name on the title page we may infer that the book is procurable by other admirers of Dr. Morell, both as a man and a writer, especially teachers, who invariably found him one of the most kind and sympathetic of inspectors, who may not be able to claim relationship or personal friendship.

In the educational world Dr. Morell was known by his "Grammar" and "Analysis of Sentences"; and among thoughtful students by several philosophical works, including a volume on the Philosophy of Religion, regarded as "the most complete and systematic work on the subject in the English language." A frequent preacher in his early years, his mind could not entertain the crude theology of his time, and later on, when asked by an old German lady to what sect he belonged, he replied: "Once I was a theologian, but now I am a philosopher." This, as Professor Meiklejohn, who relates the anecdote, says, "meant that he had left the unsafe ground of dogmatism without evidence, and had entered upon an inquiry into truth with such aid as he could find in his own mind and in the thinkers that had preceded him."

The book is beautifully printed on fine paper with wide margins, and illustrated by three photographs and two engravings.

\* Memorial of John Daniel Morell, M.A., LL.D., H.M. Inspector of Schools. By Robert M. Theobald, M.A., M.R.C.S. (London: W. Stewart and Co., Farringdon-street.)



## THE ESOTERIC BASIS OF CHRISTIANITY.

## A REJOINDER.

Two letters appeared in last week's "LIGHT" complaining of certain points in my review of Mr. Kingsland's book: one of them by Mr. Kingsland himself. To these I now proceed to reply.

Without having recourse to the expression which Mr. Kingsland so plentifully applies to me, and speaking of the "fallacies" which underlie so much of his argument, I would prefer to say that it is evident that we look at the principles involved from different points of view. This, at all events, is how I see them.

To me what we call "this world," our present plane and environment, is the manifestation to my present faculties of the Spiritual reality, and it does not of course follow that because I seem to see what I take to be disorder that the disorder is actually there. Mr. Kingsland admits that Order may be in "the universe in its *final* conception" (the italics are mine). I would suggest to him that here is possibly the point of difference between us. He speaks of the *final* rather than of the *actual*; I was speaking of the *actual* rather than of the *final*. If he is arguing upon the view that there is disorder *now*, but in the *end* the "discords will be resolved" and all will be Order, he has not quite caught the point I was contending for in my review of his book. That point is that the Whole being (as I must believe) an Order, there can be no part or aspect of it *really* out of order, but only seemingly so.

A wise friend of mine used to say to me, "If you were Omnipotent and Omniscient you would not change a single thing that has been in the past or that is now." Surely Mr. Kingsland must see that what to us looks like disorder must be an uncognised Order; for if not there is no Order at all worth the name. It is absurd to predicate Order as the noumenal, and then speak as if disorder were real and not phenomenal. Far wiser and truer does it seem to me to speak, not in terms of disorder, but in terms of growth and evolution. The earlier stages of an evolution are not necessarily disorderly: at all events, they can never be pronounced to be so from *a priori* reasons. Nothing could prove disorder but to know perfectly what the full and perfect end aimed at was, and to have watched the whole process to its end and see that that end actually reached was not the end aimed at, but short of it. That would prove that somewhere or other in the evolution something had resisted the forces making for orderly evolution, and had, *ipso facto*, introduced disorder. But no one is justified in asserting that this or that is disorderly upon merely his own *a priori* views of what the end being worked out must be, and upon the notion that the phenomenon in question does not seem to be conducing to the evolution of it.

At the same time, it does not follow from this that no one is to be a reformer, or even a propagandist. All I urged was that "a true Universalist" (that is, one who has discerned that Order "is" and disorder only seems) "cannot be a propagandist." The Universalist believes in unfolding or evolution. The propagandist believes in destroying and in evil as an actuality. The real fact to the one is Order, to the other is disorder. I was not "condemning" Mr. Kingsland for propagandising; I was only pointing out the obvious truth that, in assuming a great force of evil which it required all the efforts of himself and other earnest men to resist, he might be a very fine humanitarian, but was certainly not an Universalist in my sense of the word.

I trust I am as earnest as Mr. Kingsland in desiring to promote all sorts of reforms, and to make things "apparently" better than they seem to be. But the spirit in which I work must be different from Mr. Kingsland's. I look upon myself and my powers as "factors in the Order," which that Order is ordering in an absolutely right and necessary way to outwork the evolution which is in progress. When I am moved to push or pull, I push and pull; sure that I am right in doing so. If, while an impulse to push or pull is felt someone suggests to me a reason, which seems conclusive to my mind, why it would be better not to push or pull, I refrain from so doing, and again quite confidently, knowing that the Order must be, in the most absolute sense of the word, adequate to manipulate its elements. So that whatever I do or don't do, I do it or don't do it heartily and confidently, although often, of course, I do not myself

clearly understand and see just how my action, or someone else's, fits in rightly into the Order; but yet I am sure as a matter of principle, which I am incapable of doubting, that the Order "is," and that therefore disorder "isn't."

Now, I admit most frankly that the principle here involved is one which cannot be argued about. I have not the smallest wish to convert Mr. Kingsland to my views of the case. It is a question, not of argument, but of vision. If Mr. Kingsland and I are standing back to back we necessarily cannot see just in the same way; but we may both be true to what we each do see for all that. The propagandist, on the contrary, feels that everyone who differs from him must be wrong, and is most eagerly anxious to convert him. He is consequently often an impertinent, interfering, self-satisfied man; sometimes an earnest, loving, but saddened soul, but always one of the two; either more glad that he is right than sorry that others are wrong, or more sorry that others are wrong than glad that he is right.

But I do not call that man a propagandist who works cheerfully, lovingly, and sympathetically for the truest that he can see, because he loves to serve, and because he is sure that out of his and everyone else's efforts *must* come the perfect end. Such a man, if he finds his efforts seemingly unsuccessful, will not get saddened or morose; for he knows that in the Order success and failure, winning and losing, are one: loss is loss of the apparent, which means gain of the real, and thus in the terms of the Unity Law, loss + gain = 1. That there should by any possibility be such a thing as loss of the real and gain of the apparent is a thing he cannot so much as contemplate, because in that case the Order would be disorder, and  $x \div \text{not } x$  would equal 2.

I hope now that Mr. Kingsland will admit that the question between us is one of premisses and not of conclusion. "Fallacy" applies only to the latter: misapprehension is the word to use of asserted error in the matter of the former. If I have erred it has been not a fallacy, but a misapprehension; for, given my premisses, my conclusions (I venture to feel sure) do logically follow from them.

With Mr. Green's letter I shall deal more briefly.

1. "Not one in five hundred Christians believes there is an Esoteric meaning in Scripture," *ergo*, there is none. I cannot say from memory what the Christian population of the globe comes out at—some millions, any way. At Mr. Green's own rate there are one thousand nine hundred and ninety-nine Christians in every million who do believe that there is an Esoteric meaning in Scripture: and as one positive piece of evidence outweighs any number of negative pieces, why I think I shall have to assert that there is here not misapprehension but fallacy.

2. "I quite agree with Mr. Kingsland that there is no Esoteric Christianity in the Church." As this rejoinder happens to be penned by a clergyman of the Church of England, I should like to ask Mr. Green whether he is prepared to affirm the truth of the conclusion of the following syllogism?—

The Church is a body in which there is no Esoteric Christianity.

The writer of this rejoinder is one who is a member of the Church.

Therefore, the writer of this article is one in whom there is no Esoteric Christianity.

Is he prepared to assert that I myself do not accept, or know anything about, an Esoteric meaning in Christianity?

3. The Church is not a body of doctrines, but a body of persons. As the persons constituting the Church evolve and see more clearly, the doctrines of the Church—that is, of the persons who form and constitute the Church—will evolve. *Ergo*, private judgment will not necessarily "doom" the Church, but only certain views which used to be held, and to some extent even now are held, but in ever decreasing number, by the persons who constitute the Church.

4. "Christianity is Divine Truth," quotes Mr. Green, and then asks—"Yes; but what Christianity?" I said in my review, Christianity *in esse*. Buddhism, *in esse*, I would, of course, admit to be also Divine truth. But Christianity *in posse* is one thing and Buddhism *in posse* is another thing, and "Theosophy" *in posse* is a third thing. I don't admit that Christianity *in esse* equals Theosophy *in posse*; though I would admit that Christianity *in esse* might equal Theosophy *in esse*. But while we are here in the region of *posse* rather than of *esse* (as far as consciousness goes) I do not see what end is served in



speaking of very differing conceptions (as to *posse*) under one term, especially when that term itself describes, not a synthetical, but a very antithetical presentation. Just think of the calmness of assumption involved in this claim of Mr. Green's! "Theosophy as taught by us," Mr. Green says in effect (that is, Theosophy *in posse*), "contains all that is true in Christianity and in Buddhism. In a word it is Divine truth"! I do not for a moment think that Mr. Green means to make such a preposterous claim; but this is just the sort of thing that the Fellows of the Theosophical Society are always saying, and they must not take it hard if we sometimes forget to interpret for them. I trust that in this reply I have not displayed any party feeling or animosity; for though I do not belong to the Theosophical Society—not believing in Karma or Re-incarnation—I do heartily believe that no difference of apprehension ought to make men feel, or act, in an unbrotherly spirit. I am obliged both to Mr. Kingsland and Mr. Green for their animadversions; for they have shown me points upon which I now see that greater clearness of expression is desirable. I hope in some future papers in "LIGHT" to treat of these points more individually than in this passing and general review has been possible.

G. W. A.

### THE STORY OF THE GLACIER.

[The following very beautiful story has been sent to us by a friend. It was received through automatic writing.—ACTING EDITOR OF "LIGHT."]

Once upon a time, long, long ago, when the dear Lord dwelt alone upon the earth and man was not yet created, there was a glacier. The head of the glacier was in the skies, and its feet were in the valley. The valley was all stony and bare; no tree nor flower grew there, for there was no water.

Now in the morning and in the evening the dear Lord walked in that valley, and when He came the glacier put a veil of gold upon its head, and the glacier was happy.

Now as years went on the Lord God was lonely, therefore He made man that He might pour out His love upon him, and man filled the earth and cultivated it, but none dwelt in the valley at the foot of the glacier, for there was no water there. Now it came to pass that the glacier was unhappy, and one morning he said to the dear Lord: "My Master, would that I were of some use in this world of Thine; would that man could dwell under my shade, and that the valley would smile under my glance." And the Lord said, "If thou art willing to suffer, it may be." And the glacier said, "I am willing." And the Lord smiled upon the glacier, and when He smiled a sharp pang went through the heart of the glacier, sharper than a sword-thrust in the bosom of a tender woman. But the glacier would not cry out, but bore the anguish in silence; and in a moment his heart was rent asunder, and from it flowed a mighty stream of living water. And the water laughed and sang, and leaped down into the valley, pouring its life-giving stream through all that spot.

And it came to pass in the course of time that trees and flowers sprang up there; man came and planted the corn and wine; and little children looked up into the face of the glacier and smiled, and the glacier was happy.

Now there stood by the glacier One, and he said to the Lord, "My Father, why is it permitted to the glacier to have this divine joy of suffering, while to Me, Thy Son, it is not permitted?" And the Lord said, "My Son, I have done all things well." And the Son bowed His head and worshipped.

Dear friends, take this for an allegory.

A debate on Theosophical Symbolism will be held in St. George's Hall, Langham-place, Regent-street, W., on Tuesday November 10th, 1891, between the Rev. J. J. B. Coles, M.A., and Mrs. Annie Besant, F.T.S. Mr. Coles will affirm the following proposition: "That the historical and esoteric explanation of the symbols of the Serpent and the Cross, as given by Madame Blavatsky, is both defective and misleading, and, therefore, instead of throwing true light upon the signs and symbols of ancient and modern religions, is calculated to deceive earnest seekers after truth." The chair will be taken at 8 p.m. precisely. Admission to the Hall, 1s. Numbered and reserved seats, 5s. and 2s. 6d. Tickets for the reserved seats may be obtained from the Rev. J. J. B. Coles, 20, Solon New-road, Clapham, S.W., and at the Theosophical Publishing Co., 7, Duke-street, Adelphi, W. C.

### RESULTS OF ASSURANCE.

The all of life comes by influx.—"Arcana Cœlestia", No. 4,151.

Man is *man* from what he receives through his internal from the Lord; and is a *wild beast* from what he derives from the external man.—"Arcana Cœlestia," chap. 3, No. 270.

Leaving now any reference to Christian Science or disagreements in Swedenborg's teaching, it will, I think, be interesting to notice how many everyday oddities of human nature are explained when we accept his saying that "spirits who are with man put on his persuasions."\* Metaphysicians, of course, will tell us that they fall under such and such laws of mental action; but these laws give no light upon their origin and satisfy me as little as would an outline of a plant in full growth, when I was in search of its root. From the days of Virgil onwards, the truth of that saying of one of his heroes, "we could, because we thought we could," has been universally exemplified: reflecting on it, *because* has no obvious force, such as it would have if the sentence had been "we thought we could, because we could." Again when writing about Luther, Sir James Stephens said that "his powers of mind were doubled by consciousness of their greatness," the same results of confidence are noted; and we must all feel the truth of Capel Loft's axiom, "Confidence for worldly ends is of the same efficacy as faith in religion." But why should confidence have this magical effect? Assuredly the united belief of many people strengthens any special current of thought; must not the persuasions of a number of spirits surrounding us tell upon our own? and if we all feel exhilarated or depressed by the moods of visible companions, must not those invisibles with whom we are more closely associated, necessarily increase either elation or dejection of mind—thus raising or lowering vital force?

The unjustified confidence of conceited people may seem to run counter to what has been said above, but friends who have had temperamental opportunities for studying the disease, assure me that so far from being a proof of confidence it is a nervous disguise for a painful sense of inability, like the bragging of cowards. It may be so, and yet leave undisturbed the presumption that such a fund of self-complacency, as often goes by the name of conceit, must supply cheerful spirits with ground enough for infusing more and more.

One of the most curious laws of human nature is that of the attraction to any specific kind of ill-doing, which is felt when once it has been consciously committed. Force of habit can hardly account for this, when the transgression is new; nor the common figure of speech, as to the foot sliding further downward when once it has slipped on a declivity; for so far from a downward course being easy—externally—we know that, short of legal penalties, obstructions of many an irksome kind usually bar the way; yet if once a guilty act has been committed, or falsehood prepense been told, others of like nature are sure to follow, even if detection has already covered the offender with disgrace. Swedenborg's report explains this; a human will has laid down a basis for spiritual congeners to build on, the persuasion that sin will be expedient.

To a very different order of spirits building-ground is given by the frame of mind so earnestly enjoined by those religionists who hold "the doctrine of assurance." This persuasion that salvation is secured, if it attracts humble, hopeful spirits to truly devout minds, will, no doubt, increase piety; but unhappily such a persuasion may be acquired on mistaken premises before there has been any real effort to "work out" the salvation from sin, which only Christ *in us* can secure. The lifting up of the brazen serpent for the cure of the Israelites bitten by live serpents, seems to me a striking example of what assurance guaranteed by Divine promise can effect.†

No one, I suppose, thinks of the obedient gaze as in itself remedial; and the cure resulting from it is called miraculous, until we learn from Swedenborg how such healing may have been wrought by a natural sequence of cause and effect. "The influx of the angels," he says, "is into that which a man knows and believes." ("Arcana Cœlestia," Chap. 47, No. 6,206.) Faith in this case was no doubt the substance (the *substratum*, let it be, to make clear my meaning) of influx of healing from unseen helpers.‡ Just as clearly due to natural

\* "Arcana Cœlestia," No. 5,860. † Num. xxi. 8, 9.

‡ This explains what is called *faith healing* now. "Nevertheless, the ministries which they fulfil are not from them, but from influx from the Lord."—"Arcana Cœlestia," 6,482.



causation, on a plane invisible to us, may have been the promise to Elisha, seemingly so arbitrary, that if at the departure of Elijah he should see the mode of his removal, a double portion of his powers should accrue to him.

Quite an intelligible condition, to those who know that clairvoyants are more open to mediumistic influences than people of closed internal sight. If Elisha proved that he had sight for objects hidden from the outer man, Elijah would be able to infuse spiritual gifts. So at least I venture to translate the narrative, being so old-fashioned as to believe it true.

Our ignorance of spiritual laws has probably given to many a saying of our Lord Jesus Christ, an aspect of willing that so and so—it *shall* be, when He spoke from knowledge of how it *must* be; a seeming requisite for all who have to learn to obey before it is possible for them to understand the advantages of obedience, in this or that particular, *e.g.*, "He that hath to him shall be given, and he shall have abundance," &c., &c.\* Our associated spirits add what accretions they can, to states of thought and feeling that are—nothing to mere professions of either. "Whatsoever things ye desire, when ye pray, believe that ye receive them and ye shall have them."† "According to your faith, be it unto you."‡ All fall under the same rule.

Of late years a perception of the magic of strong persuasions has been won and utilised by several leaders of thought in America, always foremost in advance. Mr. Prentice Mulford and his co-worker, Mr. Needham, have pushed it to very bold extremes, teaching that by fixity of hopeful volition we may acquire every good we seek; and to obviate any suspicion of seeking help by prayer which, in Colonel Olcott's judgment, is "a mere survival of barbarism,"§ "a Church of silent demand" was prescribed; and no doubt some kinds of success have been won thus when persuasion was so well grounded as to attract congenial influx from unseen friends. And now the professors of "*mental science*" are eloquently persuading such minds as can be persuaded, that the unassisted *I* of every human being is able to cure diseases, to direct growth (presumably to add one cubit to stature if desired) and to set aside the tyranny of death. All this process of man being his own Almighty helper is to be effected by guiding the "God-principle" on lines laid out by himself.

It is not the impiety of this hot nonsense|| that surprises me so much as the meagreness of knowledge it betrays. In a universe full of beings of every order, swarming on every plane of existence with creatures of closely graduated interdependence, how crude and bald the theory which restricts all that is effected in man to man only! as if he was a potentate unrelated to his own subjects, and severed from all other principalities and powers in a limitless *plenum* of worlds.

Really this is a narrower view of life's mystery than that of old-fashioned Christians who allow no larger inventory of spiritual powers in touch with man, than God and such archangels as are spoken of in Scripture, one devil and his agents, and one or two guardian angels to each human being—enough to account for the term "ministering spirits," in the Book of Hebrews.¶ But we would fain ask Mrs. Helen Wilman if, as according to her, "God is the law of attraction," "the law of vitality" is "the seen and unseen side of nature" (besides several other abstractions), must not angels be God also? and as such have power to influence mankind? and if they have, how can man be credited with effecting all he does, or will do, solely by his own illimitable "Godhood"? Perhaps for consistency's sake angels have to be ignored in this system; for angels are messengers, and there must be a

sender of a message. No "God-principle" could be suspected of such personalities. The great point aimed at in this new science seems to be release from any claim upon man for obedience, adoration, and love such as is due to a Holy God; even she who says "these bodies are God in organisation" cannot apply that word holy to what she calls the "Godhood" of our fellow-creatures.

Lest I should be suspected of misreading the drift of her doctrines, the following passage from a contributor to "Wilman's Express," May, 1891, must be given in full.

Before a personal God it is man's duty to bow in humble obedience, in the presence of an impersonal force it is his duty to command. Rights attach to persons—impersonalities have no rights. As between man and a personal God, God has all the right, and man has no right, but only duties, the duty of obedience. As between an impersonal God or a force in nature and man, man has all the rights and God has none. C. C. POST.

Yes; that is the deduction, to which all this "tall talk" about man being "God incarnate" necessarily leads. With the deadly narcotic of a half truth "crime is an error and not a crime" (as true and as false as the earliest tempter's "ye shall not surely die"), these professors of healing are lulling the cries of conscience, which before or after death must be listened to, are doing all that sophistry can do, to break the yoke which alone has enabled the weakest of mankind to support life's heaviest burden; under which yoke that rest for their souls is found which will be sought in vain elsewhere.

Tell the infant tottering as he tries to walk that by virtue of his manhood he needs no helping hand, and you will be as wise as those who assert that by virtue of man's "Godhood" he is independent of the Divine humanity.

"God," Boehme wrote, "is only a *person* in Christ." But as in the Lord Christ is all the fulness of the Godhead, which in men, mere fractional sparks from that Sun, can never be, therefore we adore and worship Him as in one sense truly a personal God, and as truly the only man. In the man Christ Jesus we have revealed to us both the love of the Father—His Father and ours ("Christ is the anointed of God, which God hath manifested out of the name Jehovah or Jesus")\* and the love of a Divine brother who has been through the humiliating temptations of our earthly life, and after Himself overcoming them all, is still "touched with the feeling of our infirmities," and "able to save to the uttermost those who come to Him." Such a brother has tender compassion for those who are trying to believe a law, a principle of life, an impersonal force, all that can be known of God, for those who mistake man *as he now is* for a manifestation of God: though they thus flatter mankind, if they are seeking to serve it with pure goodwill, the Light of the world will suffuse even this cloud of error with a helpful colouring, and good angels find a plane on which to operate; for "the Lord leads man according to his delights and also according to fallacies, and the principles thence received, but He gently leads him out from thence, and this appears to man as from himself."†

An assertion that may seem directly to contradict the whole drift of Swedenborg's teachings as to influx, but one of his cardinal doctrines, is that "The Lord flows in in a twofold manner, namely, through Heaven mediately and from Himself immediately.‡

A. J. PENNY.

WHAT DYING FEELS LIKE.—The pain of dying must be distinguished from the pain of the previous disease; for when life ebbs sensibility declines. As death is the final extinction of corporeal feelings, so numbness increases as death comes on. The prostration of disease, like healthful fatigue, engenders a growing stupor—a sensation of subsiding softly into coveted repose. The so-called agony can never be more formidable than when the brain is the last to go, and when the mind preserves to the end a rational cognisance of the state of the body. Yet persons thus situated commonly attest that there are few things in life less painful than the close. "If I had strength to hold a pen," said William Hunter, "I would write how easy and delightful it is to die." "If this be dying," said the niece of Newton of Olney, "it is a pleasant thing to die." "The very expression," adds her uncle, "which another friend of mine made use of on her death-bed a few years ago." The same words have often been uttered under similar circumstances.

\* Boehme's "Third Apology, Third Point," Text 4, Par 10.

† "Arcana Coelestia," No. 6,472. ‡ *Ibid.*

\* Matt. xxv. 29. † Mark xi. 24.

‡ Matt. ix. 29. § "Theosophist," May, 1890.

|| Though, for unintended profanity, I never met with anything so shocking as the article entitled "I," in "Wilman's Express," May, 1891. Quite as extraordinary is its reference to God the Father, in the sense accepted by the Christian when using that expression, seeing that Mrs. H. Wilman's constant endeavour elsewhere is to prove that God is a law, force, a principle, whereas in this paper she writes of God as *Him*, and from an old-fashioned point of view. Perhaps logic is not included in the programme of mental science.

¶ As a sample of this wonderful construction of thought, I must cite words of a good man writing not many years ago: "Satan cannot be everywhere, for he is but a creature, and can only be in one place at a time, tempting and annoying" (one would like to have his itinerary.) . . . "it is true that he has a multitude of evil spirits at his command, but as very little is explained about them in Scripture their permitted doings are a mystery to us; they are very inferior, doubtless, both in capacity and force."—T. Moore's "Counsels and Thoughts for Believers," p. 93. (Mr. Moore's estimate of their powers must give hostile spirits lively satisfaction.)



OFFICE OF "LIGHT,"  
2, DUKE STREET,  
ADELPHI, W.C.

#### NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The Annual Subscription for "LIGHT," post-free to any address within the United Kingdom, or to places comprised within the Postal Union, including all parts of Europe, the United States, and British North America, is 10s. 10d. per annum, forwarded to our office in advance.

The Annual Subscription, post-free, to South America, South Africa, the West Indies, Australia, and New Zealand, is 13s. prepaid.

The Annual Subscription to India, Ceylon, China, Japan, is 15s. 2d. prepaid.

Cheques and Postal Orders should be made payable to Mr. B. D. Godfrey, and should invariably be crossed "— & Co."

All orders for papers and for advertisements, and all remittances, should be addressed to "The Manager" and not to the Editor.

#### ADVERTISEMENT CHARGES.

Five lines and under, 3s. One inch, 5s. Column, £2 2s. Page, £4. A reduction made for a series of insertions.

#### NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

"LIGHT" may also be obtained from E. W. ALLEN, 4, Ave Maria-lane, London and all Booksellers.

## Light :

EDITED BY "M. A. (OXON.)"

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 31st, 1891.

**TO CONTRIBUTORS.**—Communications intended to be printed should be addressed to the Editor, 2, Duke-street, Adelphi. It will much facilitate the insertion of suitable articles if they are under two columns in length. Long communications are always in danger of being delayed, and are frequently declined on account of want of space, though in other respects good and desirable. Letters should be confined to the space of half a column to ensure insertion.

Business communications should in all cases be addressed to Mr. B. D. Godfrey, 2, Duke-street, Adelphi, W.C., and not to the Editor.

### "ANCIENT BELIEFS IN A FUTURE STATE."

Mr. Gladstone, with that versatility which in years to come will be remembered as one of the most striking characteristics of an extraordinary man, has seen fit to publish an article in the "Nineteenth Century" for October, on "Ancient Beliefs in a Future State." That this production is in many ways an able one goes without saying, but whether the distinguished writer has clearly seen some of the conclusions to be drawn from his facts and arguments is an open question.

Mr. Gladstone's investigations have led him to this: "That the movement of ideas between the time of civilisation in its cradle, and the time of civilisation in its full-grown stature, on the subject of future retribution, if not of a future existence generally, was a retrograde, and not a forward movement." A dilemma at once follows: Either belief in a future existence is a good thing, and therefore civilisation is an evil thing, or civilisation is a good thing, and belief in a future existence of no importance. That Mr. Gladstone thinks a belief in "immortality" a good thing is evident from his concluding passage where he speaks of the Redeemer standing in Judæa, bringing life and immortality fully into light. Therefore, whatever may be said about the special or hidden designs of Providence, if there be such a thing as evil at all, civilisation is an evil thing.

That the transitions of the philosophy of Ancient Greece have very much influenced the writer was to be expected, and tracing them in their downward course he says: "And whatever may be said of the speculations of Plato, an intellect more muscular, more comprehensive, and more entirely Greek—the intellect of Aristotle—places the element of duty at a distance from human life as wide as that of the Lucretian heavens. This was not evidently, because of a decline in intellectual capacity. But the aggregate of the influences operative upon human perception had enfeebled the sense of the unseen present. The presumption, though (thus far) no more than a presumption, herewith arises that it would also enfeeble the sense of the unknown future." This presumption Mr. Gladstone proceeds to develop into certainty, and if the belief in "immortality" which seems to be used as synonymous with "future state," is a good, then the indictment of Greek civilisation is at any rate a very serious one.

The idea of immortality "was, then, an article of the national belief in the heroic age. What became of it in the classical period? It faded out of notice. There grew up instead of it that remarkable idea of the self-sufficiency of life, which became a basis for Greek existence." That "remarkable idea" seems to have become fairly permanent, and the present day civilisation, though not that of ancient Greece, agrees with it at any rate in the belief in the self-sufficiency of life. The theological dogma of the immortality of the soul does not count in our rules of conduct. Our civilisation is as material a civilisation as that of Greece, with a few retrogressive steps added, for there still lingered about Greece the spirit of the beautiful in art, all was not as yet sacrificed to the Moloch of commercial success.

That the Mosaic law did not inculcate the doctrine of future existence is asserted by Mr. Gladstone, and he falls back on the witch of Endor as a proof that a belief in that existence was held privately by the people. "It was rather a private opinion than an obligatory belief." And then there comes this remarkable conclusion, "It obviously follows that it did not form a part of those truths, or of that system, which the Jewish people were appointed to maintain and to transmit. It was not Divinely intrusted to them, as part and parcel of their special work." On the assumption of a Divine system which in the fulness of time was to produce a perfect method of salvation, this is doubtless right, but it is very difficult to realise this assumption if it be true, as Mr. Gladstone says in a few paragraphs further on, that "the Hebrew race supplied us with the spiritual force which was to regenerate the heart and will of man." That spiritual force, if it existed at all, depended on the belief in, and practice of, "mediumship" among the Hebrew people themselves, in defiance of the theocratic system which was for a time so powerful an engine of material prosperity.

That Mr. Gladstone claims for Greece at least an equal share with Israel in the preparation for the coming of the Christian Gospel is exactly what one would have expected, and his claim that the other races of the world have been for something in that preparation—if such preparation there were—is as proper as it is refreshing, but in the history of all these races there stands out the indubitable fact that with advancing "civilisation" there was retrogression as to the belief in the existence of a world outside this present one. Mr. Gladstone repeats his first assertion under another form when he says, speaking of the teaching and influence of nations extraneous to the "chosen people" "that in the infancy of the race of Adam, and before its distribution over the earth, the Almighty imparted to it precious knowledge, which it could hardly have discovered and was but indifferently able to retain."

On the hypothesis then that belief in immortality is a belief in truth, and that to deny the existence of another world than this is a mistake, and that men once had the knowledge of that other life given them by the Supreme Being, and that they have lost it, and that this loss has taken place in all the ages while "progress" was continuous, we cannot help coming to the conclusion that such a civilisation is an evil.

And Mr. Gladstone points out, apparently unwittingly, how that civilisation came about. The personal action of the Evil Spirit is involved in the notion of the Fall, and according to a very large school of theology, that action has been continuous in its effect. Moreover, Mr. Gladstone shows that though the Old Testament does not identify this Evil Spirit immediately with the serpent in Paradise, yet that the action of such a spirit is mentioned in several places in that Old Testament. And he adds a very striking account of the universality of the belief in the "awful tradition" of a war in Heaven in which Satan was overthrown, as it was handed down among the older nations.



Now the civilisation which has blurred the clearer notions of the older world is a civilisation which has grown up on the foundation of this fallen humanity, a humanity fallen because of the action of the evil spirit, one at least of whose great objects would be to destroy a knowledge which makes for any form of righteousness.

Mr. Gladstone thus shows that that civilisation for which we claim so much, and which has done so little, has been the main factor in the destruction of a belief, which, originally rooted in knowledge, was one of the choicest possessions of as yet an uncorrupted world.

That this conclusion was not what he aimed at is quite possible; nevertheless, it is not easy to see any other.

### "NEW TEACHING FOR THE NEW AGE."

During the past summer, in the numbers of "LIGHT" from July 18th to August 8th, there appeared, in the form of an advertisement,\* a remarkable series of brief papers, headed as above. They may well have been passed over by most without perusal. No one, not intent on the possible merits of a medium or a patent medicine, expects to find matter of much interest in your advertising columns. Nor is the docile and attentive disposition proper to students of a new wisdom excited, in the first instance, by the signature, "Rejected." Some great teachers have been rejected by their unworthy generation, but it does not exactly follow that everyone who has tried and failed to obtain contemporary hearing is a great teacher. Nevertheless, a casual glance at this "New Teaching" must impress anyone with the sobriety and seriousness of the writer, and a more careful perusal will suggest that he has a real meaning, and may have arrived at positive results of importance by a method as yet too obscurely indicated. Possibly he may become more communicative with the appearance of some symptom of aroused interest. His antecedent experience has evidently not encouraged him to take much trouble with the public, and his recent overture has somewhat the air of being dictated more by a sense of duty, rather tiresome, and not at all hopeful, than by any importunate anxiety for recognition or response.

The theme—the symbology of the Bible—is that of which Mr. Edward Maitland is the most conspicuous exponent, but is here conceived from a point of view wholly different from his, though, perhaps, not therefore incompatible with it.

The first thing naturally to be expected from a "new teaching" is the announcement that the old teaching is altogether wrong. And as to that, a good many of us are already quite prepared to say "Agreed." Mr. Maitland says the same thing, arguing that the appropriate subject-matter of a religious revelation can be nothing but the spiritual potentialities of man, and their evolutionary effectuation; that, therefore, every apparent departure from this theme must be recognised as parabolical, and representative of it; and every apparent misdealing with the theme, by individualising the concept of a Divine Humanity and dramatising historically the metaphysical process of its evolution, must be interpretatively reconverted into the order of truth which it was intended to signify, thus superseding that bondage to the letter according to which the sensuous understanding has so long imposed upon human faith conceptions of religion, disorderly in themselves, pernicious in their results, and incredible to progressive intelligence and information.†

It is at present not possible to compare this view of revelation and interpretation with that of "Rejected," for the simple reason that we are not given at all distinctly to understand what the latter is. Being told, however, that

\* Repeated in the subsequent weeks. The entitling of the advertisement was, we learn, by the Editor.

† See "The Bible's Own Account of Itself," a small book just reprinted from articles in the "Agnostic Review" (Stewart and Co., 41, Farringdon-street, E.C.), for a very clear and succinct statement by himself of Mr. Maitland's position. He says that the Bible is not addressed to the senses; and this is doubtless true, as Mr. Maitland means it. But it must be remarked that it is just because it is addressed to the understanding of the senses in the first instance, that it necessarily offers a concrete dramatisation of religious truth, just as a dream (which corresponds to our phenomenal life) always dramatises ideas; and we may find in this tendency a natural justification of the dramatic form of revelation. There is a perfect analogy between a true symbolical dream and its interpretation, and the historical representation of ideal truth, exciting or eliciting the perceptions of a higher faculty.

the Bible implies that "our civilisation was started by higher intellects, by some not of earth-origin, but possessing experience derived from countless worlds"—in fact the rulers of a "space-society"—we may infer that the recovery of the true civilisation, which we are said to have lost, is what is contemplated as the end to be attained by a recovery of "the oracle," i.e., of intercourse with those space-rulers. Evidently this is very different from all antecedent conceptions of religion. It comes nearest, perhaps, to that of Mr. Laurence Oliphant, who looked to a collective inspiration for the solution of social problems. But the author of "Scientific Religion" was faithful to the idea that such inspiration could only be conditional, as it would, he said, be certainly consequent, upon a regeneration of human nature, or a radical reform of its dispositions. Now "Rejected," we rather think, ignores that condition; at least, gives not the least hint that its establishment is primarily intended by the Bible revelation, unless, indeed, we might conjecture that to be meant when it is said: "It is specially pointed out, our civilisation fails by leaving out two important elements. Using ten foundations instead of twelve, utterly neglecting two; which two?" But the disparagement of "the ideas of old saints and others in times of intense ignorance," and of conceptions of "Right and Wrong" as the foundation of a social system, seems to exclude that supposition. We are unwilling to suspect that the writer confounds the ideas of Religion and Morality, and their respective spheres, but he is certainly at no trouble to distinguish them. However, the time for criticism has not arrived.

The introductory idea is this: Current views of the Bible are derived from a time when mankind had no conception of other worlds in space than their own, and have never yet been reformed in correspondence with advancing knowledge of the immensity of the spatial universe. And yet we have not ceased to attribute universality of character to the source of its inspiration. Now, certainly, if the object of the Bible is to give us a perfect social law and organisation, to regulate the external conditions of human society, it is proper to suppose that such an organisation would be modelled on a universal plan, and would be a scientific structure, such as might well have been symbolically represented (to take the instance given) by the original Temple. We have abandoned ourselves, it is said, to our own devices, and so everything has gone wrong, and can only be repaired by the "brain-labour" (the penalty in Genesis) of re-seeking the lost intercourse with our superiors, who have left us not without symbolical instruction for the purpose.

Now, we are bound to say that there is not very much in this view, so far as yet stated, to conciliate confidence, and it departs from metaphysical conceptions of religion which seem more profound and more satisfying. We have no belief in either the perfection or possible stability of any social order which does not arise out of interior dispositions. But we must remember that the Bible, supposing it to have the one character, may also very easily have the other, and we should all the more admire the transcendent skill and compass of its symbolism, if it could be discovered to contain a great social scheme, as well as a revelation of more essentially spiritual character; and, in that case, the connection between the two would doubtless be not far to seek, and the objection above-stated would be thus obviated. "Rejected" evidently believes with assurance that he has the clue necessary for working out the system in detail. "If I live, I can promise the plans, though I will not give them myself, I will only shew how to obtain them, which is much more important, for it really shews how to interpret oracular responses, and may prepare for renewal of oracles." We are warned that a great deal of labour will be required from anyone undertaking to learn, and it is surely not too much to ask that the preliminary information given should be sufficiently definite and encouraging to offer a strong presumption that the labour would not be bestowed in vain.

C. C. M.

THE bulk of mankind believe in two gods. They are under one dominion here in the house, as friend and parent, in social circles, in letters, in art, in love, in religion; but in mechanics, in dealing with steam and climate, in trade, in politics, they think they come under another; and that it would be a practical blunder to transfer the method and way of working of one sphere into the other.—EMERSON. ("Conduct of Life: Fate.")



## AN ASTRONOMER'S PHILOSOPHY.\*

(From "Neue Spiritualistische Blätter.")

TRANSLATED BY "V."

Under the title of "Urania" the well-known French astronomer, Camille Flammarion, member of the Paris Academy, published some time since a work which attracted much attention.

The concluding sentences, translated, run as follows:—

"The foregoing incidents, investigations, and remarks are here set forth in the form of a treatise in the attempt to give some guidance to the solution of the greatest and most interesting problems of the human mind. With this object, the work is recommended to all those who, in the midst of their life's journey, sometimes come to a halt, and ask themselves who and what they are; those who seek, meditate, and dream."

Flammarion endeavours to put before his readers the newest and most universally interesting discoveries in astronomy, as well as those connected with it in natural science, in an attractive garb and in language easy to be understood, and in connection with these subjects to introduce his philosophical views. The author is highly scientific in his method, and argues only from experience, as long as he is treating of concrete, material things. But when he diverges into the purely spiritual domain of metaphysics, he draws the most sagacious conclusions, which he knows how to embellish with striking, well-grounded hypotheses, in which, according to our ideas, here and there, there is a little too much idealism.

Flammarion is naturally an adherent of the evolution theory, but rejects dynamism in its outward deductions, and assigns to the "psyche" an independent position, overruling everything. Some chapters are poured forth with all the glow and enthusiasm of a youth; and the style, attractive and engrossing, united with brilliant and often even poetical phrases, justifies the attention which the work has excited, especially in France. Its deep scientific purport, its enthusiasm for nature and for everything beautiful, and finally the boldness and ideality shown in the treatment of supernormal questions, remind us often of Jules Michelet.

It does one good to see such thoroughly optimistic conceptions of the secrets of the universe promulgated by such a noted scientific author, in contradistinction to the unsatisfactory and depressing ideas of materialism, ever raising fresh doubts in the mind.

The work, which is embellished with charming and clever illustrations, is divided into three parts.

In the first we take a flight through the universe in company with all the recent discoveries in astronomy. The second part deals with metaphysical questions, the author introducing us to a young and ill-fated savant, whose fate is narrated; while the third gives us Flammarion's own peculiar system of philosophy, which, however, is for the most part grounded upon modern natural science.

We may be excused for giving a translation of the following passages taken from the third part of the work, entitled "Heaven and Earth," which Flammarion puts into the mouth of a dead comrade and friend, of whom the second portion of the book principally treats, and which contain in brief phrases an exposition of his own philosophical views:—

"The following is the scientific testament of a spirit who, during his sojourn on earth, made every endeavour to keep himself unshackled by the fetters of materiality, and who now hopes to be quite freed from them.

"I wish to leave behind the results of my experimental researches in the form of aphorisms. According to my opinion we can only arrive at the truth through the study of nature, that is, by science. I now give the conclusions which seem to me to be arrived at by this inductive method.

"1. The visible, tangible, ponderable universe, which is in incessant motion, is composed of invisible, intangible, imponderable, and motionless atoms.

"2. In order to form bodies and to originate organic beings, these atoms are governed by force.

"3. Force is the fundamental cause (Grundwesenheit).

"4. The visible, the tangible, solidarity, hardness, and weight are relative qualities, not absolute realities.

"5. The infinitely small. The experiments made in the sub-dividing of gold-leaf show us that ten thousand of these leaves together have only the thickness of a millimeter, and by placing a millimeter on a sheet of glass it has been found possible to sub-divide it into a thousand equal portions. Yet there are infusoria so infinitesimally small that they can exist between two of these equal portions without touching them; the limbs and organs of these beings are composed of cells, these of molecules, and these again of atoms.

"Twenty cubic centimeters of oil poured upon a lake is sufficient to cover 4,000 square yards (meter) of water, so that this layer of oil thus distributed is only of the thickness of the two hundred thousandth part of a millimeter.

"6. The intangible, invisible atom, scarcely to be conceived by our minds accustomed only to surface knowledge, is the only true matter, and what we call matter is nothing but phenomena acting upon our senses through the motion of atoms, that is, the incessant possibility of impressions. From this it follows that matter, like the manifestations of force, is only a species of motion. If the power of motion were to cease, if force could be annihilated, if the heat of bodies could be reduced to an absolute nullity—then matter, as we know it, would cease to exist.

"7. The visible universe is composed of invisible bodies. That which we see consists of 'stuffs' which we cannot see. There is only one kind of primordial atom. The molecules which compose different bodies, such as gold, iron, water, oxygen, &c., only differ from one another by the number, disposition, and motion of the atoms of which they are formed.

"8. Our so-called matter becomes involved when approached by scientific analysis. We find, on the contrary, force, the self-acting force of nature as the preserver of the universe, the principle of everything created. Upon our earth the motion of all atoms is the mathematical result of every wave of æther, which reaches us in time from the abysses of infinite space.

"9. The soul is the fundamental cause of the human being. The body is a transitory phenomenon.

"10. Atoms are indestructible. The force which keeps atoms in motion, and governs the universe, is indestructible.

"11. The individuality of the soul has originated with the history of the earth. Our planet was first a ball of vapour, then a sun, finally it became a state of chaos, at which period no being existed on the earth. Life began with the most elementary organisms, and has progressed from age to age till the present epoch, which is not the last. Understanding, reason, conscience, and all the faculties of the soul are of recent origin. Spirit has step by step released itself from matter; something like—to use a rude simile—gas is developed from coal, scent from flowers, flame from fuel.

"12. Psychic force, during the last three or four thousand years, has begun to make itself evidenced in the higher circles of earth's inhabitants. Its effects are only beginning to be manifested.

"Souls which are conscious, or still unconscious, of their individuality, are, by reason of their peculiar nature, independent of the conditions of time and space. Neither after the death of the body nor during their lifetime are they dependent upon them. Some are perhaps selected on this account to inhabit other planets. Only those arrive at the consciousness of their incorporeal and immortal existence who are free from the fetters of matter.

"13. Earth is a province of the eternal home; it is a part of heaven; heaven is infinite; all worlds are portions of heaven.

"14. The systems of planets and stars which the universe contains are in different stages of development and progress. Their development is infinite; their inhabitants are everywhere in close connection with the worlds.

"15. All planets at the present time are not inhabited. The present condition has no greater significance than past or future periods. Myriads of centuries ago some planets were inhabited; others will be so in the future, not perhaps for myriads of years! Of our earth at some future period nought will remain, even its ruins will be destroyed.

"16. Earth-life is not the prototype of other lives, but rather does infinite diversity prevail in the universe. There are inhabited regions where gravity attains a far greater

\* The following account of Flammarion's celebrated work is taken from the "Täglichen Rundschau" ("Daily Review").—Ed. "Neue Spiritualistische Blätter."



degree, where there is no light, where feeling, smell and hearing are the only senses, where, for want of the undeveloped nerve of sight, all beings are blind. On the other hand there are regions where gravitation is scarcely perceptible, where beings are so light and ethereal that they would be invisible to our earthly eyes, and where these beings receive impressions on their highly developed senses which would be imperceptible to dwellers on earth.

"17. The space between the planets spread throughout the infinite universe does not isolate them from one another; but they are rather the more connected through the force of attraction. The power of attraction operates incessantly, at any distance, and thus creates an indissoluble tie between all the worlds.

"18. The universe forms one single unity.

"19. The system of the physical world is the material foundation, the fatherland, of the moral and spiritual world. Astronomy must act as the foundation of every philosophical or religious belief.

"Every thinking being has in himself the consciousness but not the certainty of his immortality. The reason of this is that we are the microscopic spokes of a wheel of an unknown mechanism.

"20. Man is the architect of his own destiny. According to his deeds he falls or rises. Those who cling to material interests, such as misers, ambitious men, liars or criminals, remain in the lower spheres. One unchangeable and absolute law governs creation, the law of progress. Everything is subject to this law. Our faults cause our own downfall.

"21. In the development of the soul, the moral faculties have no less value than the spiritual. Goodness, unselfishness, self-sacrifice, self-denial purify and elevate the soul as much as do study and learning.

"22. The universal creation is an infinite harmony, of which the earth only forms an insignificant and inconsiderable fragment.

"23. Nature is being constantly originated. Its law is progress. Progress is eternal.

"24. An eternity would scarcely be sufficient for the soul to see and comprehend everything in the infinite universe.

"25. The destination of the soul is to detach itself more and more from the material world, in order to attain ultimately to the higher spiritual life. This attained, soul rules over matter. The ultimate aim of man is a continuous approach to the highest perfection and to divine blessedness."

BARON VON EINSIEDEL.

### SPIRIT IDENTITY.

CASE OF THE REV. J. G. WOOD.

By "EDINA."

With reference to the editorial foot-note to this case, I now beg to enclose one of the original messages purporting to have come from this "communicator," and shall be glad if the handwriting can be compared with that of the deceased, when in earth-life. The handwriting is peculiar, but I may say that in many former instances, when I have had an opportunity of comparison, the results have been disappointing, while in others the reproduction of handwriting and signature has been perfect. I shall not be surprised, therefore, if in the present case Mr. Wood's handwriting is not reproduced.

The following is a description of the person who appeared to my daughter. On questioning her again, she states she saw him on two occasions—(1) before he wrote the first message, and (2) after he wrote the second. On the first occasion he wore a pulpit robe of black silk trimmed with velvet about the collar and shoulders; while on the second, he was attired in walking costume. Here is the description: Above middle size, dark hair, long beard slightly grey at the sides, intellectual face, nose long and sharp, brown eyes, fine expression of countenance; wore a long gold chain.

[This communication, and the one which will appear in our next issue, were received by us after "M.A.(Oxon.," had left town. This one was accompanied by a written communication purporting to be in the handwriting of the Rev. J. G. Wood. All these, at the request of "Edina," were sent on to "M.A.(Oxon.," who returns them to us with instructions to publish. He will himself possibly add a note upon the case at the end of the second paper, or in the week following its publication.—ACTING ED. OF "LIGHT."]

### DREAM VERIFICATION.

Some time in April last I dreamed that I was visiting in the same house as a friend of mine, and that our sleeping-rooms adjoined.

We had been much interested in like studies, and there was a sort of sympathy between us upon most subjects which folks call occult.

In my dream I seemed to be seized with a strange thirst—a strange longing for water.\* Accordingly I got up, determining to go in quest of supply. And this I knew would entail a walk in the night air, as there was no means of getting water in the house.

As I was going downstairs my friend, evidently aroused by my footfall, called out to me, "Wait a minute; what are you going out of doors for at this time of night? It is quite dark, and you should not venture alone. Wait until I am ready, then I will either go with you or fetch you what you want."

But I, in a spirit of mischief, answered: "If I am not able to get water for myself, I am quite sure you would signally fail."

And I went out quickly, slamming the street door after me.

It was quite dark when I first started; but gradually a soft twilight began to spread over the earth, and after awhile in the bright sunlight of early dawn, I came across a fountain near to some little cottage dwellings; from one of these I borrowed a glass, and, having filled it at the fountain, quenched my thirst and hastened to return to the house from whence I set out.

As I entered it someone said to me, "He has gone to find you. We tried to reason him out of it, but couldn't. He is sure to fall into danger, for there is a great pool outside with shelving banks, and no one can take water from that without being drowned. Many have tried but none have ever succeeded."

Then I was greatly distressed; because I began to accuse myself of my folly in not waiting for him. And now I did not know what to do: whether to set out in hope of finding him, or wait here to take care of him when he should return.

I distinctly remember how hollow the large uncarpeted room sounded as I walked up and down in an agony of suspense. Would he be spared from this terrible peril or not?

And when my hope had well-nigh failed I saw some men come in at the great door, and they were bearing between them what appeared to be a lifeless body. It was that of my friend.

They laid it down upon the floor at my feet saying, "He is almost dead. There is no hope." And certainly his face was bereft of all signs of life, but I seemed to discover a little quiver of pulsation in the region of the heart, and this rather by sympathy than aught else, and this suggested action to me. I was seized by the frantic desire of resuscitating his body at all costs to myself.

I knelt down and took both his hands in mine. I struggled into the higher consciousness with my whole human energy, as is my wont in times of great distress.

And presently a rushing torrent of vitality came pouring through me, and I knew that this current of life sped into the veins of my friend, and that he would recover.

Less than a month after this dream I was summoned to the bedside of my friend—he was dangerously ill, and the doctor gave no hope of his recovery; he seemed to be gradually getting worse, and his strength was failing; but the climax of his illness did not occur until more than a week after my arrival.

I was out of the sick chamber at the time, but my friend's mother came hastily into the room where I was sitting and said, "The end has come. I am afraid he is breathing his last. Nurse B. thinks so too. I am going to send for the doctor at once and telegraph for his brother." At these words a voice seemed to say in my ear, "Remember your dream. The time has come." I rushed into the sick chamber. It was evidently too true: the shadow of death had fallen upon my friend. His face was corpse-like, just as I had seen it in my dream, and his breath came with the hard grating sound of one who is surely passing away.

The nurse looked terribly agitated. She said, "He is going."

\* The Esoteric significance of water is knowledge.



And I answered, "It cannot be!" and taking both his hands in mine I uplifted myself in the strong desire for help, so that death might be conquered by life. And in answer the same strong flow of vigour poured through my body from the head downwards until every nerve in me seemed to be tingling and quivering with it, and I distinctly felt it pouring out of my hands into those of the patient: a sensation like that experienced by holding the wires of an electric battery.

After about ten minutes or more the night nurse came in and administered brandy. I think she was much surprised that he appeared to have enough vitality left in him to enable him to swallow, in despite of his death-like pallor; but she persevered in administering it; first by moistening his lips, and then gradually wetting his tongue with it.

Of course, I held his hands all the time, until after the doctor came. He appeared still to look at the case as hopeless. But I, who had the experience of my dream to help me, knew the crisis was over, and that whatever further trouble in this illness should come during convalescence our patient was not like to die.

I ought to add that when the nurse insisted on my loosing hold of his hands I was almost in a fainting condition, so much of my own life energy had been exhausted by the prolonged quiet necessary for inception and sending out of this new force.

Thus was my dream fulfilled, for my friend has recovered in despite of all predictions to the contrary.

E. R.

### In Memoriam.

From over the seas we have news of the departure of Henry Kiddle to (we hope) a better plane of existence. He sacrificed much that men value in their common life, and he lost nothing by his outspoken adherence to truth. Our own respect for one who thoroughly deserves it is expressed with regret by one who appreciates sacrifice and knows what it means.

We have also to record the departure from the earth-plane of an old friend, a regular attendant at our meetings, a man from whose lips an unkindly word never fell. This wreath is laid on his grave by one of our oldest Spiritualists:—

#### MR. CORNELIUS PEARSON.

Those readers of "LIGHT" who knew the late Mr. Cornelius Pearson will feel how severe a loss they have sustained on learning of his departure to the higher life, which took place on Monday, the 19th inst., in his eighty-third year. All that was mortal of him was interred in Highgate Cemetery on Friday, the 23rd inst. Mr. Pearson had been interested in Spiritualism for more than thirty years; it had rescued him from the cold and cheerless doctrine of Materialism, and was a source of great comfort to him to the end; latterly he cared for it more and more, reading books on the subject in preference to any others.

He was a member of the London Spiritualist Alliance, and had been on the Council of the late British National Association of Spiritualists; and his beautiful watercolour drawings were always an attractive feature when exhibited at the conversaziones, of the members and friends of that Association.

He had but recently returned from a visit to friends in the South of France, bringing home with him some drawings taken there which are said to be equal to any he ever painted.

He took great delight in his work, and continued it till within a week of his death. He was a member of several clubs and societies of artists and literary men.

His agreeable manners and conversation, replete with anecdote and humour, made him an universal favourite. He lived a pure, peaceful, and blameless life; he was particularly gentle, amiable, and kindly; and he passed away without suffering and so quietly that the friends at his bedside, who were most assiduous and devoted in their attentions to him, were not immediately conscious of the change which had taken place.

He was beloved by all who knew him, and leaves behind a pleasant and fragrant memory.

T. S.

**SPIRITUAL AND RATIONAL RELIGION.**—The Rev. J. Page Hopps will conduct two Meetings for Religious Worship on Sunday, November 8th, at the Cavendish Rooms, Mortimer-street, Cavendish-square, at 11 and 3. Subjects of addresses—Morning: "Where is thy God, my Soul? A Study of the Limitation of God by Man." Afternoon: "The Jesus-Side of Everything; A Nineteenth-Century Study of Human Life." All seats free. Voluntary offerings at the close.

### ERRADIATION versus CONCRETE SUGGESTION.

Hardly anyone now doubts that thought-transference, or, as it is called, "suggestion," is a possibility. Few doubt that it can be used as a remedial measure. Yet many entirely condemn the practice, on grounds which, when analysed, come to mean that (like anything else which has medicinal powers) it can be misused, and, when misused, is dangerous. But we are not to abandon a remedial agent without at least trying to find out how it should be used. Those who are making experiments on this subject would find their study more profitable and less dangerous if they would place clearly before their minds a few of the elementary principles of human psychology.

Man may be roughly described as a bundle of nerve-chains, all united at one end. The free ends are connected with organs of perception or discrimination, whether physical, intellectual, ethical, or spiritual. The united ends are gathered into an organ whose function would seem to be the conceiving of common principles underlying the phenomena perceived by the various free ends. (The basis of this statement is the mathematical analysis of the Laws of Thought, made—simultaneously but independently—by Gratry and George Boole.) Nervous currents should flow "up and down" the chains, and never jump from the outer end of one chain to the outer end of another. "Never" is of course not meant to be absolute for healthy people; a healthy man can stand a good deal in the way of bad conditions. But when we undertake to treat one who needs help, our first care should be to eliminate, at least from our own action on the patient, elements which are unhygienic; and it is most distinctly unhygienic to attract a thought-current from one chain to another, without passing it through the united ends (or reason-ends) of the chains. Now, let us examine, in the light of this principle, the possible ways of treating by suggestion a person who has got one of his nerve-chains over-irritable at its free end. (He may have at the stomach-end of the nerves used in alimentation a restless craving for alcohol; or he may see, with some outer brain-faculty, a friend's conduct in an irrationally bad light.) We can try one of three plans: Either (1) make a "negative" suggestion to the part actually affected; try to lull or narcotise (magnetically, of course) the over-irritable part. Or (2) we may try to divert force from the affected organ by stimulating some other (outer) faculty; suggesting some different interest or emotion or thought, of a definite and concrete kind; suggest to go and hear some music instead of quarrelling with the friend, or to freshen himself up with a country walk instead of drinking brandy. Or (3) we may try to arouse, magnetically, the reasoning organ. The first plan (negative suggestion) is permissible only as opiate-lotions are permissible—with great care, and always with the understanding that we are doing a thing not in itself quite right, because the suffering, or evil, is worse than the remedy. As a habit, such calming processes are bad. The second plan (diverting force by definite concrete suggestion) is temptingly easy, and productive of immediate good-seeming results; and, of course, for the operator, pleasant, in that it gives a great sense of power. But I believe it is always most thoroughly bad. The only really hygienic mode is the third; suggesting some general principle of reason or morality; thus helping the patient's conscience and reason to act, and then leaving the central organ, thus aroused, to act on the outer ends of the nerve-chains in its own way.

Of course, I know that in condemning the practice of concrete "suggestion" I am attacking the very stronghold of cheap and easy Spiritualism. I can only say that the practice seems to me contrary to the clearest indications of mathematical psychology; that the whole experience of a long life (spent largely among occultists) has taught me to think it as perilous as the random use of drugs; and that more than one medium has written (automatically) very serious warnings against it. It will be said that no one objects to audible suggestions of a change of thought; to playing music to a cross child, or inviting a drunkard to go for a walk. But, in the first place, nature has so arranged things that one cannot make audible suggestion of a diversion without more or less stirring the reason-end of some chain. In the next place, the wise and pious always accompany the audible suggestion of an external change with magnetic suggestion at the reason-end; whereas, if the magnetism of the



suggester is concentrated on concrete suggestion, he is not in the right state to suggest principle. In the third place, though I do not object to diverting an unreasonable person's thoughts by audible suggestion, I do think that most people trust, far more than they should, to this natural and comparatively harmless method. The name "erradiation" has been given to magnetic suggestion at the reason-end of the chains. On the whole it seems to me a suitable word for the purpose.

MARY EVEREST BOOLE.

### SPIRITUALISM AND SCIENCE.

The loftiest aim which can influence a human being is a striving after what we call knowledge. In its pursuit the mind expands, and the influence of worldly appetites and desires becomes less as the higher part of our nature is developed, and Mind rules Matter with a firm but equable sway. The opponents of Spiritualism have long been accustomed to urge that the principles which it unhesitatingly advocates, when examined from the standpoint of science, are utterly unable to bear the test imposed, and by means of which they must be declared true or false, proved or disproved. While fully accepting the position in which science places any claim to truth, there seems no just ground for the generalisation which many have drawn, namely, that if science is true the teachings of Spiritualism are false.

The ardent supporters of the most advanced views of materialism are perforce bound to base their arguments on the methods which logic has marked out clearly and definitely for the pursuit of investigations having for their end the discovery of the true and the rejection of the false. The most casual observer of the methods which Spiritualists adopt to further their cause cannot fail to have been impressed with the invitation constantly made to investigate the subject, with a view to testing its merits or demerits, and the veracity of the statements put forth for impartial examination.

The whole fabric of which the science of Chemistry is composed rests on what may be justly claimed to be a scientific belief rather than a scientific truth, since the molecule has never been made cognisable, and while the solution which it gives to the difficulties which formerly surrounded the combination of elements is amply plain to the scientific mind, it would be futile to hope, in any discussion which might be raised against its existence, to bring to the disbelieving one any further proof than is afforded by the scientific theory on which it rests for verification by its results.

In approaching the investigation of phenomena, of whatever description they may be, it is absolutely necessary that the mind of the observer be in a state of doubt. Doubt, in its true meaning, does not imply the rejection of any theory without consideration of its claims, but rather the holding of the judgment in suspense, inclining neither one way nor the other, but ready to accept evidence for or against the theory that may be advanced. Here lies the stumbling block over which so many of us have for a time, perhaps, unhappily fallen. There is in our nature a disposition to reject the inconceivable as false without patiently endeavouring first to apply a test carefully and impartially before we draw a conclusion. We are so apt to take the opinions of others as reliable because in the past such have been approved by our friends, and thus we fail to grasp the elementary principle that as new stores of knowledge are opened to us, the views of former days, however admirable they may have been at the stage of progress then reached, are in want of modification, if they are not altogether erroneous.

The rival theories of the propagation of light need only to be mentioned as instances how the new replaces the old, how the teachings of the past lead up to the grasping of the truths of the present, how science is not the antagonist but the handmaid of spiritual teaching. To establish any truth as such, mere assertion is useless; calm, dispassionate investigation alone can bring light to our darkened perceptions and help us to realise the hidden truths that lie so near to our hands, but to which prejudice has blinded us and so left us without a knowledge that may cheer and inspire us, when it is obtained, to do whatever lies in our earthly power to forward the advancement in all things of the race to which we belong.

Let us, then, consider the methods adopted in giving scientific proof of the existence of anything to which we may have hitherto not sufficiently attended. Such existence is established in accordance with science if we bring it under our immediate observation, or infer its presence through marks or evidences when it is beyond that range. There is no earnest inquirer into the principles and truths of Spiritualism who may not have clear proofs furnished by both methods. The former needs but one instance to test its validity: the latter—the method of inferential investigation, which is quite as logically correct—may be tried again and again by accepting the invitations which Spiritualists hold out to those who seek in a true spirit of reverence, and who are actuated by a real desire to understand the higher principles of life which are known to those who have laid aside the prejudice of disbelief and become humble disciples of a far-reaching and all-pervading truth.

C. J. M.

### "THE A B C OF THEOSOPHY."

A little pamphlet designed to give what the writer says that in his own case he at first found great difficulty in obtaining,—a simple and clear statement of the first principles of Theosophy. On examination it appears to contain few principles but many dogmas, and reminds us much of the style of ordinary orthodox Christian evidential tracts. From this book we learn among other things that "in a secret Cave-temple in Thibet, accessible only to initiates" is "an actual volume or volumes, which is the book of all truth." (This is dogma and not a principle.) Again, "Christ was the last great Nirmankaya who came at a crisis when special intervention was necessary. . . . The Christian revelation is incomplete, like all other revelations, and the time is rapidly approaching when its living force will perceptibly wane." (Again, dogma and not a principle.)

The writer concludes by quoting Gamaliel's saying: "If this counsel or work be of man it will come to nought; but if it be of God ye cannot overthrow it"; and appeals to us, upon the strength of this saying, not to presume to attack that of which we know practically nothing. Now if Theosophy is sure that this principle is sound, i.e., that truth cannot be overthrown by any attack, why this anxiety to deprecate attack? If we were Theosophists we should rather desiderate opposition and say "Come on! and you shall find your own weakness and our strength."

### SPIRITUALISM AT LAKE PLEASANT.

Judge Dailey writes thus to the "Religio-Philosophical Journal" of one of his experiences at the Camp Meeting at Lake Pleasant:—

While I was at Lake Pleasant this season, despite the disturbed condition of affairs—always prejudicial to sensitives—many remarkable tests were given from the platform. Mr. John Slater, who has in several respects greatly improved, gave some as pointed tests as it is possible to give in a promiscuous audience. Take, for instance, a single test to illustrate my purpose: He claimed to discern the presence of the spirit of an elderly man who stated to the medium his desire to communicate with an elderly lady in the back part of the audience. The spirit announced himself as her husband, and gave his name, which the lady designated admitted to be correct. "Are you the mother of eight children?" asked Mr. Slater. "I am," was the reply, "You are the mother of ten children," continued Mr. Slater. "for it is so shown to me, and their names are—" here the medium repeated their names; all of which the lady admitted to be correct. "Your husband says you are much disturbed about selling the old homestead. Some of your children wish you to sell it and you are in a quandary about it. Is that so?" asked Mr. Slater. She admitted it was correct. "Well, he tells you not to sell it. He says you are talking about cutting down some old trees, and he tells you to cut them down, then you will not be pestered by the boys stealing the apples." "Say, lady," continued Mr. Slater, "your husband says, to give you a test, that you have put away in a closet two old blankets which were the first blankets you got after your marriage, and you and he had a hard time to get them at all. Is that so?" "It is all so," she replied. "And now he tells me," Slater went on to say, "that you and he ran away and got married when you were both very young. You were about seventeen and he nineteen. Is that true?" "Yes; all, all true," she replied. "And now, did you ever see me before?" asked the medium, to which she replied in the negative.

\* "The A B C of Theosophy." By H. SNOWDEN WARD. London: Percy Lund & Co., Ludgate Circus. (14pp., price 1d.)



## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

## The Cavendish Room Services.

SIR,—As many of your readers are specially interested in the two religious services at Cavendish Rooms, on November 8th (morning and afternoon), will you allow me to say that a simple meal will be provided at a neighbouring restaurant for those who may wish to attend both meetings?

Leicester, October 27th.

J. PAGE HOPPS.

## A Further Remonstrance.

SIR,—The "Remonstrance" by an F. T. S., published in your last number, will, I hope, be taken to heart by the lady for whom it was intended. Admiring Mrs. Besant, as all must who know her and believe in her earnest and truthful nature, I as well as the writer of the letter referred to have deeply regretted the exaggerated tone which runs through all her encomiums on Madame Blavatsky. That Mrs. Besant should be willing to "stake her life and honour on the slightest word Madame Blavatsky ever uttered" will not change the opinion of those who from long and intimate acquaintance with the latter lady formed a less exalted estimate of her character. What all who knew her well are willing to acknowledge is, that her failings were of little consequence in comparison with her great qualities, for she had a grand intellect, a good heart, unbounded industry and devotion to the Theosophical cause, and was a very interesting woman psychologically. There are many within the Society at the present moment who without believing in the absolute veracity of Madame Blavatsky recognise, admire, and honour all that was great in her, but this absurd deification of her, and unlimited abuse of those who from longer experience knew better her peculiarities, does not advance the cause of Theosophy nor convince anyone that Mrs. Besant's estimate is correct. On the contrary, both those in the Society and the outside public merely see in this exaggerated praise the proof of an enthusiastic and emotional temperament which requires an object of worship. "It used to be Mr. Bradlaugh, now it's Madame Blavatsky," was a remark overheard by the writer. Mrs. Besant's chief strength lies in her earnest and eloquent appeals to our higher nature, and her example as an indefatigable worker for the welfare of her fellow creatures, but when she deals in invective and denunciation she is positively repellent; a personal bitterness seems to animate her language, which is far from the high Theosophical standard held up in her calmer moments. But all will acknowledge—and the writer most heartily does so—the great gain to the Theosophical cause by the advent of Mrs. Besant and Mr. Burrowes, and many will also recognise the no less gain to the community at large by the secession of these two from the Socialistic platform, which they by their earnestness and eloquence made a danger to the country. Their appeals now are to the hearts of all, not to the passions of the masses.

ANOTHER F. T. S.

## The Church of the Future.

SIR,—The correspondence in your columns under the above heading refers to one of the most important subjects that can occupy our thought, viz., What is the Church of the Future, and how shall it be built up? Neither the answer, "Use existing religious organisations"; nor the suggestion, "Hire a public hall for preaching and worship," meets the need of many earnest thinkers who regard a church as a congregation of men and women who, welcoming the light that is flowing in from the unseen world, earnestly desire to incarnate it in daily life.

To those who recognise that spirit shapes form, and that form, thus moulded by Divine light, becomes the medium for ever increasing influx of light, the great question that presses for solution is, How to apply the truths that we already abundantly possess, so that our daily life, in all its relations, may become the medium through which increasing light and power may flow.

In patiently seeking the applications of truth, no subject is too humble to engage our attention or too remote to affect the building of that church which is a congregation of human beings filled with the spirit of the Christ, honestly striving to mould their lives according to the Divine light granted to them. Instead of listening to the preaching of any man, however eloquent, we are constrained to ponder how those principles which we have learned to recognise as

guides of daily life, can become actualities, if that life is to be really honest, not hypocritical.

The righteous holding of land; the just relations of capital and labour; of men and women; of adult and child; of master and servant; of highly gifted and poorly endowed natures; of the individual and the community—the solution of all these problems is of urgent need for the soul's welfare, for there is not one of them that is not intimately bound up with the actual daily life of each of us.

The Church of the Future must be planted on righteously held land, for the earth is the Lord's, and we are only the Lord's trustees, and land unjustly acquired or selfishly held cannot support a congregation of the faithful. The Church must be raised by capital and labour in just relation to each other. It must be filled by men and women helping one another, by mutual service, to fulfil and transfigure the daily duties of life by the Divine truth that we possess, and which will only grow as we put it into practice. Only in this way can we gather together the elementary materials of a "Church." For this purpose no new building, no separate teacher, is needed. Two or three meeting together in an "upper chamber" to consider the solemn problems of practical life with souls open to the ever-living Christ, is the first condition for the gathering of materials for the formation of a living "Church."

Every stone of the great Cathedral of Humanity must be a living soul shaping its daily life by Divine light.

"The Church of the Future" must be built out of the lives of men.

C. T.

## SOCIETY WORK.

MR. HOPCROFT'S CASE.—A séance for the benefit of Mr. Hopcroft will be given on Thursday evening, November 5th, at 7.45 p.m., Mrs. Mason medium, at 24, Harcourt-street, Marylebone.—C. WHITE.

24, HARCOURT-STREET, MARYLEBONE, LONDON.—On Sunday morning, the discussion on Mr. Dale's paper was ably sustained, and Mr. McKenzie's lecture on "Phrenology," with readings from the audience, was very instructive. Sunday next, at 11 a.m., Mr. Dale, "Mind Influence"; at 7 p.m., Captain Pfoundes, "Criticisms of Theosophy." Thursday, at 7.45 p.m., Mrs. Mason. The Hopcroft Benefit séance on Saturday at 7.45 p.m., Mrs. Treadwell.—C. WHITE, and R. MILLIGAN, Secs.

FOREST HILL, 23, DEVONSHIRE-ROAD.—On Sunday last Captain Pfoundes gave a lecture exposing Theosophy. The lecturer, who is well acquainted with his subject, showed Theosophy in such a light as to deprive it of any attractions it may have had for his hearers. Sunday next, Reading and debate. Wednesday next, at 8 p.m., Concert. Free admission. Silver collection. Thursday next, Captain Pfoundes, Address and Discussion on Theosophy. Spiritualists especially invited to this meeting.—H. W. BRUNKER, Sec.

14, ORCHARD-ROAD, SHEPHERD'S BUSH, W.—We had a good meeting on Sunday, when Mr. Reynolds lectured upon "Spiritualism, Ancient and Modern," and showed that spirit communion existed thousands of years ago. Sunday, at 3 p.m., Lyceum; at 7 p.m., Mr. Towns, psychometry. Tuesday, at 8 p.m., séance, Mrs. Mason. Saturday, at 8 p.m., a select circle. A special séance for the benefit of Mr. Hopcroft will be given on Friday, October 30th, at 8 p.m. prompt, Mrs. Spring, medium. Tickets, 1s., can be obtained of Mr. Mason, 14, Orchard-road, Shepherd's Bush.—J. H. B., Hon. Sec.

WINCHESTER HALL, 33, HIGH-STREET, PECKHAM.—Last Sunday morning we were disappointed by our speaker not attending, but had a very good meeting through the mediumship of those present. In the morning Mr. Butcher's guides gave us an excellent address upon the elements of religion found amongst all people, showing that the orthodox Christian, the Atheist, the pleasure seeker, and the Spiritualist are all religious at some moments. We are in want of instrumentalists who can give us aid in increasing the band which Mr. Butcher has inaugurated. Friday, at 8.15 p.m., Healing. Sunday next, at 11.15 a.m., Mr. Munns; at 7 p.m., Mr. Dale.—J. DALE, 4, Sidney-road, Stockwell, Sec.

SOUTH LONDON SOCIETY OF SPIRITUALISTS, 311, CAMBERWELL NEW-ROAD, S.E. (NEAR THE GREEN).—A reply to a recent sermon preached against Spiritualism by the Rev. Dr. Talmage was given on Sunday evening last. Our members have decided on the immediate purchase of a piano for our work. We intend making good music and singing a regular feature of our services and a choir is in course of formation. For a working class society the contemplated expense will be heavy, but we trust that all members will assist as their several means will allow. Several donations have been paid and further pecuniary aid is earnestly solicited. On Sunday evening next we inaugurate our musical service, and Mrs. Stanley and other ladies will speak.—W. E. LONG, Hon. Sec.